

“(m) Only those Senators who on the day preceding the effective date of this title were serving as members of the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs may serve on the Committee on Veteran Programs.

“(n) Only those Senators who on the day preceding the effective date of this title were serving as members of the Special Committee on Aging may serve on the Committee on Senior American Programs.

“(o) Only those Senators who on the day preceding the effective date of this title were serving as members of the Committee on Small Business may serve on the Committee on Senior American Programs.

“5. Upon the effective date of this title, the Select Committee on Ethics shall become the Committee on Senate Ethics, and the Select Committee on Intelligence shall become the Committee on Intelligence Oversight. However, the membership, functions, and duties of such committees shall remain unchanged.”.

SEC. 2. Paragraphs 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, and 7 of rule XVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate are repealed, and paragraphs 5 and 8 are renumbered as paragraphs “1” and “2”, respectively.

SEC. 3. Subparagraph (b) of paragraph 4 of rule XVII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by striking out “(except the Committee on Appropriations)”.

SEC. 4. Rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended—

(a) by striking out “(except the Committee on Appropriations)” in each instance where it appears,

(b) by striking out “(except the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on the Budget)” in each instance where it appears, and inserting in lieu thereof the following “(except the Committee on National Priorities)”.

(c) by striking out “The prohibition contained in the preceding sentence shall not apply to the Committee on Appropriations or the Committee on the Budget.” in subparagraph 5(a) and inserting in lieu thereof “The prohibition contained in the preceding sentence shall not apply to the Committee on National Priorities.”.

(d) by striking out the last sentence of subparagraph 10(b), and

(e) by striking out “(except those by the Committee on Appropriations)” in subparagraph 11(b).

SEC. 5. The provisions of this resolution shall take effect on the first day of the first Congress following the date of its adoption by the Senate.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, for many years I have spoken at length, both on and off of the Senate floor, about the need to curb pork barrel spending and reduce overall government waste. Around this time each year, I often engage in lengthy debates over the latest excesses in the appropriations bills, which, almost invariably, are stuffed to the gills with earmarks and pet projects.

It was noted last week that H.R. 3338, this year’s \$317 billion Department of Defense Appropriations bill, was the most expensive appropriations bill to ever pass the United States Senate. Unlike some of my colleagues, I do not believe this is something for which we deserve praise. Bills like H.R. 3338, before it was modified due to the efforts of other Republican Senators who share my concern, are prime examples

of how we are failing the American taxpayers who foot the bill for our excesses.

Time and again, I have called my colleagues’ attention to the harmful practice of earmarking, of putting parochial interests before national ones, and of funding projects in an ad hoc manner devoid of a unifying policy or goal.

Last week, Secretary Rumsfeld, after briefing a group of Senators about the war effort, was asked what the Senate could do to help. One of several requests by the Secretary was that we in Senate stop funding projects the military did not ask for or need. As my colleague from Arizona, Senator KYL, recounted last Friday night during debate on the DoD appropriations bill, the reaction to this statement was “other than that, what can we do?”

Today I offer an answer. It is premised on the recognition that part of the problem lies in the current structure of the Senate, which delegates to separate committees the functions of authorization and appropriating funds. Currently, there are no effective restrictions on funding projects that have not been considered by a single committee with technical expertise and broad policy perspective. I should mention that I do not necessarily think these are the authorizing committees.

To help provide a unified, uniform policy basis for our spending of taxpayers’ money, I am introducing a resolution today to reorganize the committees of the United States Senate with the hope of helping to eliminate spending on unauthorized and unauthorized pet projects.

Under this Resolution most of the existing committees would be dissolved and reconstituted as policy, administrative, or leadership committees. The Resolution would merge the functions of the authorizing and appropriations committees by having members of the existing appropriations subcommittees serve with current members of the existing authorizing committee on newly created “policy committees” that correspond to the issues they currently cover.

This resolution is not a new idea. It was introduced during four previous Congresses by one of our former colleagues, Nancy Kassebaum. I was a proud cosponsor of this legislation then, and I find it particularly timely now. This is a sound proposal for real reform, and I hope that my colleagues will join me in supporting it.

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 190—AUTHORIZING THE TAKING OF A PHOTOGRAPH IN THE CHAMBER OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE

Mr. DASCHLE (for himself and Mr. LOTT) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 190

*Resolved*, That paragraph 1 of Rule IV of the Rules for the Regulation of the Senate Wing of the United States Capitol (prohibiting the taking of pictures in the Senate Chamber) be temporarily suspended for the sole and specific purpose of permitting the Senate Photographic Studio to photograph the United States Senate in actual session on Wednesday, January 23, 2002, at the hour of 2:30 p.m.

SEC. 2. The Sergeant at Arms of the Senate is authorized and directed to make the necessary arrangements therefor, which arrangements shall provide for a minimum of disruption to Senate proceedings.

#### SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 92—RECOGNIZING RADIO FREE EUROPE/RADIO LIBERTY’S SUCCESS IN PROMOTING DEMOCRACY AND ITS CONTINUING CONTRIBUTION TO UNITED STATES NATIONAL INTERESTS

Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. HELMS, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. SMITH of Oregon) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. CON. RES. 92

Whereas on May 1, 1951, Radio Free Europe inaugurated its full schedule of broadcast services to the people of Eastern Europe and, subsequently, Radio Liberty initiated its broadcast services to the peoples of the Soviet Union on March 1, 1953, just before the death of Stalin;

Whereas now fifty years later, Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty (in this concurrent resolution referred to as “RFE/RL”) continues to promote democracy and human rights and serve United States national interests by fulfilling its mission “to promote democratic values and institutions by disseminating factual information and ideas”;

Whereas Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty were established in the darkest days of the cold war as a substitute for the free media which no longer existed in the communist-dominated countries of Central and Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union;

Whereas Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty developed a unique form of international broadcasting known as surrogate broadcasting by airing local news about the countries to which they broadcast as well as providing regional and international news, thus preventing the communist governments from establishing a monopoly on the dissemination of information and providing an alternative to the state-controlled, party dominated domestic media;

Whereas the broadcast of uncensored news and information by Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty was a critical element contributing to the collapse of the totalitarian communist governments of Central and Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union;

Whereas since the fall of the Iron Curtain, RFE/RL has continued to inform and therefore strengthen democratic forces in Central Europe and the countries of the former Soviet Union, and has contributed to the development of a new generation of political and economic leaders who have worked to strengthen civil society, free market economies, and democratic government institutions;

Whereas United States Government funding established and continues to support